REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended independent Claims 7 and 14 to clarify the subject matter intended to be claimed and to address the informalities alleged therein. Claims 1-6 and 9, 13 and 15 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, Claims 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 16 and 17 are pending.

In the Office Action, Claims 7-8, 10-12, 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,699,513 to Feigen et al. ("*Feigen*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,406 to Coile et al. ("*Coile*"), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,068 to Winiger ("*Winiger*").

Without acceding to the rejections, Claim 7 now recites, *inter alia*, rerouting to a second port of a gateway machine, by ordering a network layer (CR) of the gateway machine, any message sent and addressed to a first port of a server machine, followed by deleting, by ordering the network layer (CR) of the gateway machine, any message sent to a third port located in the server machine regardless of a security level of said message sent to the third port. Support is provided, for example, at page 11 of the English language translation of the International Application (original Claims 1-3); page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 22; and FIGs. 4 and 5 (e.g., block 44); and page 8, lines 6-15; and FIG. 1.

It is apparent that the applied references do not teach or suggest at least the above features of Claim 7.

For example, the Office Action acknowledges at pages 5-6 and 9 that the primary reference, *Feigen*, does not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of

Claim 7. The secondary reference *Coile* apparently also does not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of Claim 7, nor does the Office Action rely on *Coile* for such teaching. However, the Office Action alleges that *Feigen's* and *Coile's* failure in this regard is cured by the teachings found in secondary reference *Winiger*.

In contrast, however, the portion of *Winiger* relied on in the Office Action apparently teaches discarding a packet if the packet security classification is not the same as or higher than the security classification of a destination port. *See* Winiger, col. 6, lines 6-9. Thus, *Winiger* is not understood to teach or suggest rerouting to a second port of a gateway machine, by ordering a network layer (CR) of the gateway machine, any message sent and addressed to a first port of a server machine, followed by deleting, by ordering the network layer (CR) of the gateway machine, any message sent to a third port located in the server machine regardless of a security level of said message sent to the third port, as recited in Claim 7.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 7 distinguishes patentably from the applied references.

Claim 14 has also been amended to recite, *inter alia*, activating, in the gateway machine, a secure application proxy that reroutes the messages addressed to the first port of the server application away from the first connection, in a way that is transparent to the client application, so as to establish a second connection having a second security level with the server application, and that deletes, by ordering the network layer (CR) of the gateway machine, any message sent to a second port of the server application regardless of a security level of said message sent to the second port.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 14 also distinguishes patentably from the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 7.

The remaining claims are also believed to be patentable due to their respective dependence from independent Claims 7 and 14, as well as for the additional features recited in the remaining claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-907461) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, P.C.

By: _____
Edward J. Kondracki
Reg. No. 20,604

October 17, 2007

Eric G. King
Reg. No. 42,736

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
Telephone: (703) 610-8647
4842-7754-8033